UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/593,579	09/20/2006	Eiichi Kaji	2006_1387A	1456
WENDEROTH, LIND & PONACK, L.L.P. 2033 K STREET N. W.			EXAMINER	
			LU, C CAIXIA	
SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20006-1021		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1796	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/19/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/593,579	KAJI ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Caixia Lu	1796				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 6/6/03	8.					
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	- action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowan	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-15</u> is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) 4-15 is/are withdrawn	4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>4-15</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-3</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ acce	epted or b) objected to by the E	Examiner.				
Applicant may not request that any objection to the o	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
Attachment(s)	🗖					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date						
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application						
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6) Uther:						

Application/Control Number: 10/593,579 Page 2

Art Unit: 1796

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for the polymethylaluminoxane composition in toluene have the specified limitations, does not reasonably provide enablement for the polymethylaluminoxane composition in any solvent to meet the specified limitations of the instant claims. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. The viscosity of the same aluminoxane composition varies with the solvent; the specification only supports the aluminoxane composition with toluene as solvent.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102/103

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and

the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Smith et al. (US 5,831,109).

Smith's Examples 2 and 4 demonstrate the preparation of the polymethylaluminoxane (PMAO) composition substantially free of trimethylaluminum (TMAL) by reacting TMAL and benzoic acid in toluene with catalytic amount of polyaluminoxane (PMAO). It is noted that Smith does not expressly disclose the viscosity of the PMAO prepared from the Examples. However, in Smith's PMAO preparation process, the reaction between TMAL and benzoic acid is quantitative, therefore, the molecular weight of PMAO, which determines the viscosity, can be controlled by varying the ratio of TMAL to benzoic acid. As the TMAL/benzoic acid increases, the molecular weight of PMAO decreases, which reflects in lowered PMAO viscosity. It is noted that the ratios of TMAL/O of benzoic acid in Smith's Examples 2 and 4 are 1.27 and 1.25 respectively, which are about the same as the TMAL/O ratio of 1.26 of applicants' Example 5. Therefore, one would have the expected the viscosity of those examples to inherently to meet the limitation of the instant claims.

Even if the claimed viscosity are not inherent in the PMAO composition of the prior art examples, it would still have been obvious to a skilled artisan to prepare PMAO composition with lowered viscosity to prevent the gel formation.

Once a product appearing to be substantially identical is found and a 35 USC 102/103 rejection made, the burden of proof is shifted to the applicants to show an unobvious difference. In re Fitzgerald, 205 USPQ 594. In re Fessmann, 180 USPQ

Application/Control Number: 10/593,579 Page 4

Art Unit: 1796

324. Applicants have not met their burden to demonstrate an unobvious difference between the claimed product and the products of the prior art examples.

6. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Smith et al. (US 5,831,109).

Smith's teaching is relied upon as shown above. It is noted that Smith does not expressly use toluic acid; however, Smith does expressly disclose that non-limited carboxylic acid can be used in the in the PMAO preparation process. It would been obvious to use any carboxylic acid such as toluic acid in the PMAO preparation process since toluic acid is inexpensively commercially available and have very good solubility in toluene.

Thus, it would have been obvious to a skilled artisan at the time the invention was made to employ Smith's teaching to prepare a PMAO composition substantially free of TMAL with various viscosities since such is within the scope of Smith's teaching and in the absence of any showing criticality and unexpected results.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to the rejections of previous Office Action have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

Art Unit: 1796

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Caixia Lu whose telephone number is (571) 272-1106. The examiner can normally be reached from 9:00 am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful and the matter is urgent, the examiner's supervisor, David Wu, can be reached at (571) 272-1114. The fax numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-1700.

/Caixia Lu/ Caixia Lu, Ph. D. Primary Examiner